DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 779 CS 501 235

TITLE Comparative Strategies of the Black and "Chicano" Movements in Achieving Economic and Social Justice.

PUB DATE 76

NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the World Population Society Western Region (Long Beach, California, January 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *Civil Rights; Economic Status; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Higher Education; *Justice; *Mexican Americans; *Minority Groups; *Negroes; Social Development; Social Values; Sociocultural Patterns

IDENTIFIERS Black Movement; Chicano Movement

ABSTRACT

Frequently references to spokesmen and issues of the Chicano movement for social and economic equality refer to prior experiences of the black American mass social movement. Through examining both mass social movements, it becomes obvious that exact comparisons are misleading. Numerous similarities in economic, social, and political suppression and exploitation have been experienced by both movements; but significant differences between the two movements make such comparisons inaccurate and misleading. First, linguistic and cultural differences are pronounced; second, different attitudes exist toward family structure and responsibilities; third, differences in attitudes of society in general have resulted largely from the historical distinction between a "conquered" people and a "captured" or "kidnapped" people. Effects of these differences justify unique remedies rather than merely adapting those techniques used to resolve black American needs as solutions to resolve Chicano economic and social needs. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117779

COMPARATIVE STRATEGIES OF THE BLACK AND "CHICANO" MOVEMENTS IN ACHIEVING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

by Willard A. Underwood,
Ralph E. Ferguson,
and Raymond Yeager

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Abstract

Frequently references to spokesmen and issues of the Chicano movement for social and economic equality refer to prior experiences of the Black American mass social movement. Through examining both mass social movements, it becomes obvious that exact comparisons are misleading. Numerous similarities in economic, social and political suppression and exploitation have been experienced by both movements; but sigrificant differences between the two movements make such comparisons inaccurate and misleading. First, linguistic and cultural differences are pronounced; second, different attitudes exist toward family structure and responsibilities; third, differences in attitudes of society in general have resulted largely from the historical distinction between a "conquered" people and a "captured" or "kidnapped" people. Effects of these differences justify unique remedies rather than merely adapting those techniques used to resolve Black American needs as solutions to resolve Chicano economic and social needs.

CS 501 235

COMPARATIVE STRATEGIES OF THE BLACK AND "CHICANO" MOVEMENTS IN ACHIEVING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

by Willard A. Underwood,
Ralph E. Ferguson
and
Raymond Yeager

In recent years all Americans have been encouraged to help resolve the social, economic and political problems which confront ethnic minorities. With the evolution and sophistication of Black American mass social movements, other minority groups have been urged to adopt similar techniques to realize their needs and interests. There are numerous similarities between the strategies, problems and expectations of Blacks and other minorities which merit comparisons; but several dissimilar factors necessitate caution in drawing parallels or expecting other minority movements to mirror exactly what the Black movement has experienced.

This paper is a comparison of the Black American and the Mexican-American[1] social movements, to identify similarities and differences between the two efforts. The paper includes six areas of consideration. First, an examination of the value of speech/communication to movement analyses. Second, the role of the Black American social movement. Third, the development of a comprehensive Black movement analysis and methodology. Fourth, an examination of the Mexican-American social movement. Fifth, comparison and contrast of the Black American and Mexican-American social movements. Sixth, summary and conclusions to the study.

Presented at the World Population Society Western Regional Meeting, Long Beach, California, January 24, 1976.

This paper rests upon four assumptions. First, the vast majority of Americans has relatively little knowledge of the Black, Mexican-American or any other ethnic minority. Second, much information about minority groups is misleading and inaccurate. Third, regardless of how earnestly one might seek information about any minority social movement, such information is not easily accessible. Fourth, despite these difficulties, the study of minority speakers and communication behavior should be a concern of scholars and social activists. Thus this paper provides a guide for further exploration of Mexican-American communication by drawing meaningful comparisons between the Mexican-American and Black American mass social movements.

I. The Value of Speech/Communication in Movement Analyses

What can the speech/communication scholar do to help resolve social, political and economic problems? Analyses of speeches and interviews with spokesmen can provide insights into history, indicate how spoken discourse functions as a technique for social action, explain specific controversies, and clarify conditions which to the casual observer are confusing. Kenneth Burke notes that "the basic function of [speech/communication is the] use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents,"[2] while William Lang describes the speaker as a force in history who can direct and mold his times.[3] Thomas Nilsen argues that "a vital function of speech criticism should be to interpret the meaning of speeches . . . in the sense of what the speech indirectly implies for man and the society in which he lives."[4] Alfred Croft adds that one function of speech criticism is "to report and interpret the

manner in which a speaker's social values have been related to the social values of his audience in the course of his rhetorical adaptation."[5] Waldo Braden and Earnest Brandenburg note that "the persuasive speaker knows what he wants from his audience. In the light of his listener's inclinations he selects his materials, organizes his speech, and adopts a manner to gain his predetermined goal."[6] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird add that "speeches occur in social settings . . . [Thus] rhetorical criticism helps to interpret the function of oral communication in society . . . it reveals the nature of the process by which a communicative intent finally implements, or fails to implement, social action."[7]

Thus through analyzing the communication of individual spokesmen, mass social movements may be analyzed to determine why certain tactics work under given conditions while others do not; the evolution of ideas into a final construct may be studied; implications for future spokesmen, concerned with the same or similar movement, may be advanced. In the case of Black spokesmen, James Golden and Richard Rieke note that oratorical excellence is a major reason for the success of such leaders as Frederick Douglass, Martin Luther King and Malcolm X.[8] Charles Lomas presents a clear view of the function of individual spokesmen:

> Specific agitations, whatever their outcome, usually benefit society by calling attention to sore spots in the social order and demanding that solutions be found. It is only occasionally that the solutions proposed by the agitators are adopted, but the ensuing discussion and debate bring forth alternative solutions and eventually measures are adopted which remedy the original evils.[9]

The values of studying individuals is amplified by Leland Griffin, who notes the general conclusions which may be drawn through comparisons of individual analyses:

> From the identification of a number of rhetorical patterns, we may discover the various configurations of public discussion, whether rhetorical patterns repeat themselves when like movements occur in the intervals of time, whether a consistent set of forms may be said to exist.[10]

II. The Role of the Black Social Movement

To adequately understand the significance of spokesmen and movements, it is first necessary to gain an understanding of the Black American's role in the history of the nation. The oral statements of Black Americans is one indication of what has been done and what remains to resolve racial issues. The comments of white spokesmen are also important, for white attitudes affect the understanding and improving of racial relations. The attitudes of government, business and social leaders--both Black and white--affect the rapidity and completeness with which racial equality can be achieved.

The specific procedure employed in this portion of the paper was to: (1) analyze general background information dealing with problems faced by spokesmen for the movement; (2) synthesize specific concepts and recommendations of various leaders; (3) explore communication strategies and techniques employed by these speakers; and (4) unite these ideas, strategies, techniques and solutions into a unified Black Social Movement construct.

James Golden and Richard Rieke evaluate Black protest speaking in terms of three broad communication strategies--assimilation, separation and revolution. All three strategies occur simultaneously within the movement.[11] Lyndrey Niles cautions that such descriptions are not mutually exclusive, as any speaker might be placed in more than one category on different occasions or sometimes on the same occasion.[12] Golden and Rieke identify five specific strategies of Black protest speaking in another work,[13] noting that leaders and

movements do not "fit" neatly into any distinct category for analysis; the communication behavior, rather than the speaker's strategy, can thus be categorized. These five historical-rhetorical strategies analyzed and modified for the present study are: (1) Moderation: conciliation and talent; (2) Separation; (3) Democratic Involvement; (4) Non-Violent Direct Action; and (5) Militancy/Black Power/Black Nationalism.

Moderation is the attitude that Blacks should work with available means to "make the best" of existing situations, an attitude exemplified in Booker T. Washington's admonistion to "cast down your bucket where you are," and includes those persons who feel whites should be encouraged to tolerate equalization efforts while Blacks should use moderation to seek equality.

Separation is the attitude that Blacks and whites should establish autonomous societies--a white society controlled by whites, and a Black society controlled by Blacks. This differs from segregation in that under segregation there are two different societies, but both are controlled by one (white) race. Separatism deals with those people who feel that Blacks should completely separate physically, economically, spiritually and every other way from whites. More recent refinements of the concept suggest that physical separation may not be necessary, but dependance upon whites should be eliminated.

Reliance upon democratic involvement is the concentrated effort of achieving equal rights through established systems of American government, especially as reflected in federal decrees and Supreme Court decisions. This ideology recognizes the existence of inequities, but argues that existing power structures will be responsive to change when conditions are shown to be inequitable,

that recognition of constitutional rights may be achieved through litigation in the courts.

Non-violent direct action is the massive physical protest, frequently in the form of an economic boycott, against a specific program or group. This includes the sit-in demonstrations of the early 1960s and the picketing of individual stores charged with unfair treatment of Blacks.

Militancy/Black power/Black nationalism includes the attitudes that Blacks culturally, though not necessarily physically, should separate from whites. This concept also includes the militant--sometimes violent--positive declaration of human rights. This attitude embraces the concept that all Blacks should identify with an Afro-American heritage and share interests in common concerns. On an individual basis, all Blacks are urged to take pride in a common culture.

A basic problem in analyzing what any group of people have done is that a group is comprised of individuals; thus in any given period of time some individuals will endorse attitudes other than those which are "accepted" by the group. A very serious problem in analyzing Black communication is evaluating the support accorded any spokesman, and in determining whether that support is enthusiastic or merely tacit approval. Booker T. Washington has been hailed as a prime example of a "leader" whose spokesman status was exaggerated because of his acceptability to white Americans; in actuality, contemporary militants argue that Washington's leadership was much less complete than the general public of the period was led to believe.[14] While Malcolm X had only a "handfull" of followers at the time of his death, over seven thousand people attended his funeral. Subsequent endorsements of Malcolm's ideas by later speakers indicates more

than "token" interest in his ideas. At the individual level, this observation makes analysis of a total group very difficult. Too often what the masses really thought, accepted and believed is obscured by what a few prominent "spokesmen" said. The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King in 1968 may have ended the era of "Negro spokesmen"--as most Blacks today would find it difficult to pledge their support to one leader rather than to several. Of greater concern is the belief shared by many Blacks and whites that King's non-violent ideals may have died with him.[15]

The most striking fact about the civil rights movement is not the confusion of goals, but the amount of activity and experimentation utilized to discover viable solutions. There remains a problem in achieving racial and personal identity, but this has been greatly alleviated in recent years through self-help programs and increased racial pride among younger Blacks. There has been a marked increase in identification with the Black community, and among successful Blacks identifying with others who have not been as successful. The pathology of the urban ghetto cannot wait for a gradual solution; it is a condition which still seizes a large percentage of Blacks, and is increasing in severity. The spread of the ghetto adds import to the need for constructive proposals of action in all fields where Blacks have suffered massive discrimination.

III. Development of a Comprehensive Black Movement Analysis and Methodology

What then is the role of the speech/communication scholar in contemporary Black social movement theory? Basic to the formulation of a comprehensive construct through which individual speakers and issues may effectively be analyzed is an understanding of the role of historical (historical-rhetorical) movements. Edwin Black

describes movement studies as one of the "three distinct approaches to the practices of rhetorical criticism"[16] in giving movement studies equal status with neo-Aristotelian and psychological studies. Robert Cathcart finds that movement studies can become a valuable field for the study of communication theory provided two hurdles--methodology and theoretical objections--can be cleared.[17] Concurring with Herbert Simons that "the standard tools of rhetorical criticism are ill-suited for unravelling the complexity of discourse in social movements or for capturing its grand flow" because they are "designed for microscopic analysis of particular speeches,"[18] Cathcart suggests that "our present definitions of movements are ill-suited to the formulation of an adequate theory of the rhetoric of movements."[19] Thus Cathcart offers a new definition based upon two Burkeian rations--agency-scene and agency-act, with the necessity of communicators who perceive that the established system "is in reality a faulty order full of absurdity and injustice, cry out through various symbolic acts that true communion, justice, salvation cannot be achieved unless there is an immediate corrective applied to the established order." There must also be a reciprocating act from:

> the establishment of counter rhetors which perceives the demands of the agitator rhetors, not as calls for correction or re-righting the prevailing order, but as direct attacks on the foundations of the established order. It is this reciprocity or dialectical enjoinment in the moral arena which defines movements and distinguishes them from other dramatistic forms.[20]

Thus as Cathcart concludes, the study of historical-rhetorical movements adds to our understanding of mass social movements.

Griffin notes that historical movements are linear--men become dissatisfied with existing conditions, make efforts to change their environment, then achieve some degree of success or failure. The philosophies discussed in this paper developed in a generally-chronological order. The primary importance of moderation as a

dominant theme was from 1895 to 1920; for separatism, from 1920 to 1930; for reliance upon democratic involvement from 1930 to 1955; for non-violent direct action from 1955 to 1966; for militancy/Black power/Black nationalism from 1966 to the present. These dates are arbitrary; while each philosophy was dominant in its turn, all five were present at each year in American history, and each philosophy exists today. Similarly, prior to 1895 militancy had been dominant for many years, guided by the brilliancy of men such as Frederick Douglass. But this was a different version of militancy from that which exists today, in that nineteenth-century militancy included many ideas to be found today within the framework of non-violent direct action and moderation, as well as under discussions of modern militancy.

The "immediate corrective" element identified by Cathcart as necessary is readily identifiable from most communication by Black spokesmen. The "reciprocity" communication may easily be identified by noting "backlash" or white supremacist statements.

There have been many attempts to develop and define a specific number of types of philosophies which have guided civil rights movements and activists in America. At the least, analysts acknowledge three--conservative, moderate and radical (liberal). Perhaps with adequate clarification as many as thirty distinct "philosophies" might be described. The authors admit that five is an arbitrary figure; but the five distinct philosophies analyzed and evaluated in this study represent the depth and breadth of Black protest communication.

Certain other limitations should be recognized in identifying any individual with a specific philosophy. While Malcolm X is a member of the militancy/Black power/Black nationalism concept, he

also merits consideration as a separatist during the period when he was the motivating force within the Muslim movement; W.E.B. DuBois, although properly discussed as a conciliationist during the early years of his career, changed to reliance upon the democratic process in his middle-years and in later life became very militant as his frustrations with failures and broken promises increased. When dealing with human personalities, one is required to realize that few men fit any category exclusively, nor does one man preserve the same methodology forever. Rather, the purpose of this study was to evaluate the attitudes of many prominent and influential leaders. Thus it should also be recognized that the five philosophies presented, while divergent, also overlap each other. As King noted, it is possible for one to be "militantly non-violent"; the five concepts are not mutually exclusive, and any individual might find merit in each. But there are significant differences among the five concepts, which dictate areas where each can succeed while others cannot.

Black spokesmen are unanimous in identifying five major barriers to equality. First, economic deprivation, including job discrimination, creates a problem for Black citizens because poverty is part of a cycle from which one cannot easily extricate himself. Second, lack of educational opportunities compounds the economic deprivation. Blacks are not qualified for certain jobs because of educational deficiencies and, at the same time, younger Blacks do not acquire job skills because of the need to add to the family income or because of disillusionment. Low quality educational facilities aggravates this vicious cycle. Third, social barriers prevent acceptance in virtually every area where cultural and social ostracism are practiced. Fourth, legal barriers are virtually eliminated in theory, but in

actual practice discrimination still occurs. Fifth, Black voting advances have stimulated the "white backlash" vote, which perpetuates racial hatred and mistrust.[21]

From the communication behaviors of Black spokesmen analyzed in this present study, five major conclusions are drawn.

First, to have lasting influence on the movement, a spokesman must have followers. He must represent others who concur with his thinking, with his programs, with his oral statements. As William Lang notes, "speech in harmony, or at least not out of harmony, with prevailing moods and passions is that which is most effective" under these circumstances.[22] The spokesman must accurately analyze his auditors and shape his views in a manner and style acceptable to them.

Second, the successful Black spokesman must be well-educated in both academic and "real life" domains. Two of the most prominent leaders of the twentieth century had earned Ph.D. degrees (King and DuBois); six others had earned college degrees with advanced or graduate study. Only two nationally-recognized leaders had failed to achieve formal baccalaureate degrees--Marcus Garvey and Malcolm X. Garvey probably attended at least two or three years of college; Malcolm X engaged in intensive study under the guidance of Harvard and Boston University professors who served Norfolk Prison Colony--it could be argued that this education was superior to that achieved by many college graduates. Thus national civil rights spokesmen are generally well-educated.

Third, each leader was articulate in both oral and written forms. DuBois, Wilkins, Garvey and Muhammad published the official newspapers for their respective organizations. Pamphlets, official documents and formal articles abound under the names of national leaders. Activities on the speaker's platform are important, as each leader

enhanced his status through his oral presentations.

Fourth, humanistic concerns are basic ingredients of each leader. Concerns for fair play, equitable treatment and mutual respect are strong elements in each spokesman's statements. While some spokesmen did not advocate the same degree of respect for whites, all were concerned about a universality of Black fellowship. Malcolm X, Muhammad, King and Jackson were recognized as ministers, adding official sanction to this dimension.

Fifth, each leader was able to place his movement into a larger-than-self perspective. Each spokesman played a vital role in formulating and maintaining his specific organization; often the individual's name is automatically associated with his organization. And each organization suffered loss of momentum and sometimes disbandment through the departure or death of the leader. But while Marcus Garvey's U.N.I.A. disintegrated after his imprisonment, his attitudes were reincarnated in the Muslim movement and Black nationalism alike; while Martin Luther King's death altered national prominence of the S.C.L.C., the organization remained effective in strengthening citizenship rights at local levels. Thus while spokesmen appear and disappear from the national scene, the modifications they apply to specific methodologies remain as legacies for future members of the movement.

IV. The Mexican-American Social Movement

Mexican-Americans comprise the second largest ethnic minority in the United States and the largest minority group in the Southwest. There are approximately ten million Mexican-Americans in the United States, 90% of whom reside in five Southwestern states--California, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. The economic, social and

educational levels of this populace are shockingly low.

Historically, the acquisition of Spanish-speaking citizens by the United States has resulted from military conquest. The Texas War of Independence in 1836, the Mexican War of 1846-1848 and the Spanish-American War of 1898 left little or no choice to former Mexican and Spanish-Speaking citizens to accept U.S. citizenship. In 1848, under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, Mexico lost over one-half her total land area; land which today constitutes most of the five Southwestern states where Mexican-Americans are concentrated. The geographic area of Mexico was cut to one-third its former size. Former Mexican citizens faced the decision of "returning" to their native country or retaining their land and property in a "new" country under a "foreign" judicial code. This "new country" is frequently referred to by Chicano leaders as "occupied America" or Northern Aztlan--a cultural identification with the "old" country, Mexico. Somewhat grudgingly, United States citizens were forced to accept this new minority as part of the "price" of the massive land acquisition.

Historically, the Mexican-American has suffered discrimination, disenfranchisement and segregation. The enforcement of these conditions are described by Jorge Lara-Braud, director of the Hispanic Institute at the University of Texas, who charges that:

> The powerlessness of the Mexican-American is not accidental. It is the direct result of a social system that penalizes difference and rewards conformity. To be blunt, the social, educational, economic, political and ecclesiastical structures of the state are rigidly Anglo-oriented and Anglo-controlled. This may look natural, but it is very dangerous. Under the present circumstances a Mexican-American or the member of any other ethnic minority succeeds to the extent that he becomes or appears to be a replica of at least a middle-class Anglo Texan. Until that norm is met, one remains in the category of sub-people or non-people. This explains the frequency of such descriptive phrases as the "Mexican-American problem," "the Mexican-American's cultural gap," or the "Mexican-American's language barrier." The measuring rod implied lies outside the Mexican-American community

itself. Instead, it is applied from the outside, by the powerful dominant group.[23]

The social powerlessness of the Mexican-American today is further emphasized by a University of Colorado study which concludes that:

> The Mexican American in America occupies an inferior place in the social structure through no inherent inadequacies of his own, but because of the system under which he lives. Poverty and barrio ghettoization condemn him, in large numbers, to inferior housing and limited education. The social structure confines him to the least rewarding job opportunities. Hence, he is all too often, irrevocably trapped in a vicious cycle from which he is unable to extricate himself.[24]

Senator Joseph Montoya of New Mexico explains the serious socio-economic results of systematic discouragement and denial of educational achievement and the resultant lack of economic power:

> in jobs, nearly 80% work in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs . . . in income, nearly 50% of all Spanish speaking Americans fall below the poverty line of $3,000; and in business, they own less than one per-cent of the U.S. businesses. Thus, the Spanish speaking American is not only a numerical minority, his level of living and participation in the ecoromy is so minor as to be difficult to measure. . . . Little conscious effort has been made toward assisting the second largest [minority], the Spanish speaking American. . . . the statistics on Spanish speaking Americans educational levels illustrate that the Spanish speaking American lags markedly behind all other ethnic groups. . . . ranking below the Negro in education.[25]

Montoya then illustrates the consequences of a century of economic and educational deprivation, noting that:

> Spanish speaking persons 14 years and over in the Southwest average 3.9 years less schooling than the Anglo and 1.6 years less than the non-white population including both Negro and Indian, . . . the percentage of the Spanish speaking male population in each of the five Southwestern states with no schooling whatsoever is alarming. . . . ranging from 5.3 percent in Colorado (as compared to 1.1 percent for total population and 0.9 percent Negro) to 16.0 percent in Texas (as compared to 3.4 percent for total population. . . . in every Southwestern state the percentages of Spanish-speaking Americans without grade school education are significantly greater than the figures for the total population. . . . Texas 64.7% Spanish-speaking Americans, 29.2% total population; Arizona, 52.1% versus 27.7%; New Mexico 44.4% versus 23.1%; Colorado 29.9% versus 13.9%; and California, 37.4% versus 14.4%; . . . in short, the Spanish-speaking American is being short changed on the one asset that would lift him out of deprivation and discrimination and into the mainstream of life--Education.[26]

Public education in Texas exemplifies the results of educational denial. Over one-fourth of all Mexican-American adults in the state have completed less than one year of school. Almost 40 per cent are functional illiterates--with four years or less education.[27]

With the advancements of technology, conditions for the Mexican-American have been further aggravated. Earlier opportunities were curtailed by modernized agri-business and industry. Once dependant upon cheap Mexican-American labor, southern portions of Texas and California greatly reduced the demand for unskilled labor. As Lara-Braud notes:

> With the accelerated mechanization of crops and the widespread use of domestic labor-saving devices today their [Mexican-American's] manual skills have become virtually non-marketable. In a technological society, their future is at best dim. . . . along the Mexican border area, where they are most heavily concentrated, they are further displaced, and forced into continuing migrancy, by the heavy use of cheap labor of Mexican nationals who commute daily for work north of the River.[28]

Even if the Mexican-American family migrates northward seeking work, it does not escape the economic poverty cycle. Often an entire family will leave the Southwest in late spring, working its way through several states and several different crops, to return "home" in late fall. Since most elections are held during the migratory season, migrants are effectively disenfranchised. Nor is the migration enough to break the poverty cycle. Average annual earnings for a migrant laborer in 1967 was $1,307, below the national poverty level. Compared to national averages, in 1967 migrants suffered 125% higher infant mortality, 125% maternal mortality, 200% influenza and pneumonia, 260% higher incidence of tuberculosis and other infectious diseases, 300% more accidents. The life expectancy of a migrant was 49 years, compared to 70 years for the general population.[29] As the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor noted, "no other segment of our population is so poorly paid yet contributes so much to our nation's

wealth and welfare."[30]

V. Comparison and Contrast of the Black American and Mexican-American Social Movements

The five-part rhetorical-historical analysis of the Black social movement has much adaptability to the Mexican-American mass social movement. There are numerous similarities between the strategies, expectations and communication behaviors of Black Americans and Mexican-Americans which justify comparisons of the movements; but several dissimilarities make exacting parallels and expectations inaccurate and misleading.

The most pronounced difference is that of language and culture. For Black Americans, the basic language has been English--the national language. The fact that many Mexican-Americans use Spanish as their native language means that to succeed in the white or "Anglo" dominated society, Mexican-Americans must learn a "foreign" language and become functionally bilingual. There are also differences in cultural heritages of Blacks and Mexican-Americans. While the Black family heritage is greatly distorted by slavery and discrimination, the Mexican-American was not subjected to legalized slavery. Thus much of what the Black American has sought to regain from a "lost" heritage has been unnecessary for the Mexican-American, who retained cultural ties. Attitudes toward family is one indication. Tomas Martinez, a Colorado activist, explains the differences:

> Chicanos typically participate in an extended family system. Whereas, the typical Anglo American participates in a nuclear family system. The extended family system is based upon not only a sense of obligation to take care of one's kind, but also upon a sense of love and respect for all relatives. Elderly Chicanos, for example, are not sent away to human warehouses, or rest homes. Chicanos take care of their old people. Similarly, the children and young adults are not defined as "to be seen, but not heard," as is often the situation in the Anglo white home.
>
> Within the Chicano family, the children are given a lot of warm, open love, often to the extent of spoiling them. Love rather than

> expensive material goods is the usual and frequent parental gift to the children. Whereas, the reverse situation is more typical in the Anglo white home. . . . The generation gap in the Chicano family is usually minimal, or non-existent, in terms of meaningful communication.[31]

Thus culturally the Mexican-American remains more "Mexican" than "American." With the exception of individuals who attempt assimilation, Mexican-Americans kept cultural heritage--of the Spanish, Mexican and Indian cultures. Thus the Mexican-American who seeks success in the Anglo world needs to be not only bilingual, but multi-cultural as well.

Education is viewed as a necessary tool by both movements, but the need is more pronounced for Mexican-Americans for two reasons. First, the Mexican-American must function in an English-speaking environment and an Anglo-cultural environment; second, it is relatively easier for the Mexican-American to assimilate into the Anglo community. But a counter-effect is that the Mexican-American student is continually discouraged, and made to feel inadequate, probably with greater regularity and severity than the Black student. Dr. Manuel Guerra explains the effect of intelligence tests and similar measures, which almost always indicate the "cultural lag" between Mexican-American children and Anglo peers:

> Those who make and give the tests are the most vociferous defenders of the system, which they always deny has good intentions with bad results. But it is peculiar that the same people who make and give the tests are Anglo-Saxon middle class educators or technicians, seldom Black or Mexican American professionals whose expertise might have guided the criteria toward realistic evaluations.[32]

The Mexican-American culture has been largely ignored or openly ridiculed by institutional representatives, most notably by the public schools. The incidence of Mexican-American youth in the Southwest who "heard" English for the first time when they enrolled in grade school is still common; until very recently,

public schools commonly forbade speaking of Spanish on school grounds, punishing violators. Stories about public humiliation before classmates for speaking Spanish, or being unable to speak English "well," or for simply being "a Mexican" are common throughout the Southwest. Racial bigotry and discrimination often rival incidents usually reported in Black vs. White conflicts. A recent Governor's Committee on Public School Education in Texas found, among other things, that Texas ranks 31st in median level of education and 42nd in number of high school graduates, 8th in per capita valuations but 39th in percentage of those valuations annually allocated to public education.[33] While 20 per cent of Mexican-Americans graduate from high school, less than two per cent graduate from college.[34] Only in the fall of 1974 did the state of Texas finally inaugurate a bilingual education program in the first four grades of public school for school districts with a high percentage of Mexican-American students.

As with many other minorities, representation of Mexican-American contributions to United States history and culture has been minimized. One recent Mexican-American high school graduate explains:

> From the time we first begin attending school, we hear about how great and wonderful our United States is, about our democratic American heritage, but little about our splendid and magnificent heritage and culture. What little we do know about Mexicans is how they mercilessly slaughtered the brave Texans at the Alamo, but we never hear about the child heroes of Mexico who courageously threw themselves from the heights of Chapultepec rather than allow themselves and their flag to be captured by the attacking Americans.[35]

A major factor in the new emphasis on education and other social changes has been described generally as "Chicanismo," the recognition that Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed citizens of the United States and the world have many things in common. Tomas Martinez explains:

> Chicanismo represents the denial, if not the antithesis, of the Protestant Ethic. Self worth is not dependent upon external measures. It is the "inner" life that is most important in defining worth of self and others. Thus, a person may be quite poor materially, but nevertheless, his inner life may be psycho-

> logically very rewarding. Chicanos who have become aware of the discrepancy between materialism and spiritualism share the anguish expressed by Corky Gonzales in his epic poem, "I am Joaquin."[36]

The most prominent section of the poem emphasizes the conflicts experienced by Mexican-Americans:

> I am Joaquin
> Lost in a world of confusion,
> Caught up in a world of a Gringo society,
> Confused by the rules,
> Scorned by attitudes,
> Suppressed by manipulations,
> And destroyed by modern society.
> My fathers
> Have lost the economic battle
> And won
> The struggle of cultural survival.
> And now!
> I must choose
> Between
> The paradox of
> Victory of the spirit,
> Despite physical hunger
> Or
> To exist in the grasp
> Of American social neurosis,
> Sterilization of the soul
> And a full stomach.[37]

Probably the most popular organization designed to cope with conditions confronting the Mexican-Americans is La Raza Unida, "the united race" with "race" used in the connotation of "a people." As Jose Angel Gutierrez, one of La Raza's founders, explains:

> The formation of this party came about because of the critical need for the people to experience justice. It's just like being hungry. You've got to get food in there immediately, otherwise you get nauseous, you get headaches and pains in your stomach.
> We were Chicanos who were starved for any kind of meaningful participation in decision making, policy making and leadership positions. For a long time we have not been satisfied with the type of leadership that has been picked for us. And this is what a political party does, particularly the ones we have here. I shouldn't use the plural because we only have one, and that's the gringo party.[38]

An indication of what a dedicated group can do occurred in Crystal City, Texas. In December 1969, 1700 of the 2300 students in Crystal City's public schools walked out of classes, virtually closing the

schools. After two and one-half months, during which only seventeen actual school days were missed, the school board capitulated to Chicano demands for bilingual education; participation in federal programs, especially the school lunch program; more Chicano teachers and counselors; and the right to bring "relevant" literature into the schools. During the strike several "freedom schools" operated, while high school students and adults conducted a voter registration drive which resulted in an almost 100 per cent registration of Mexican-American voters.[39] Through the confrontation, the Civil Rights Commission came to Crystal City to observe local elections, curtailing "rancher intimidation." The new city council revoked law enforcement jurisdiction of state police and Texas Rangers, voided a 20-year contract of municipal tax exemption and services for DelMonte Corporation, and received a $25,000 grand from HUD for a comprehensive city plan. The new school board instituted several new procedures, including:

1. Complete bilingual education from kindergarten through third grade.
2. A free breakfast and lunch program for every student.
3. Banning of culturally biased I.Q. tests and English proficiency examinations.
4. Use of relevant texts in the classrooms, even though not "state approved."
5. Student records were declared completely confidential.[40]

Another difference between the Black and Mexican-American movements is that there are fewer "national" leaders among the latter. Until more recently, much attention was paid a few Black leaders who "controlled" large segments of public opinion. Among Mexican-Americans, few "leaders" achieved such notoriety. Except for Cesar Chavez and possibly Reis Lopez Tijerina, the typical American has probably not heard of leaders in the movement.

Undoubtably the best known leader among Chicano activists is Cesar Chavez, who attained national attention in the fall of 1965 when he led the strike of Filipino and Mexican-American farm workers against

grape growers in the San Joaquin Valley of California. His United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (a division of AFL-CIO), successfully negotiated eleven contracts with major wine grape growers. To combat Chavez' efforts, growers of table grapes (who produce 90 per cent of the U.S. crop) traded over 100 brands among themselves to prevent any single grower from boycott; Chavez then declared the national boycott against ALL California table grapes. Lara-Braud describes Chavez' importance to the movement:

> Chavez' struggle as a symbol of redress for the Spanish-speaking cannot be over-estimated. He has challenged practically every U.S. power and principality inimical to their self-determination. Hence, his name, picture, union banner and slogans make their appearance in every other struggle of the Spanish-speaking: rural and urban strikes, efforts for collective bargaining, demands for bilingual education, voter registration drives, restraint of biased law enforcement agencies, proportional representation in juries, draft and school boards, exclusion of cheal (legal) "commuter" labor from Mexico, covering of farm workers under the 1935 National Labor Relations Act (from which they have been specifically excluded), non-discriminatory practices in general employment and promotions, and an end to the excessively large numbers of Spanish-speaking youth drafted for service in Vietnam.[41]

A devout Roman Catholic, Chavez' movement is predicated upon non-violence. Followers frequently explain his charisma as a combination of saintliness and sagacity; in 1968 he underwent a 25-day "penitential fast" to underscore his commitment to the cause. But while his workers were harassed by growers, police and continuous court actions, "establishment" forces thwarted the boycott. Government expenditures for Vietnam-bound grapes ballooned from $32,438 in 1965 and $40,575 in 1966 to a total of $214,330 in 1967 and an estimated $500,000 for 1968.[42]

Probably the second best known activist is Reis Lopez Tijerina, the fiery spellbinder and former Pentecostal preacher who has been called "God's Angry Man," "The Robin Hood of New Mexico" and more recently "The King Tiger." Tijerina founded the Alianza Federal de Mercedes (Federal Alliance of Free City States) as an effort to reclaim millions of acres of land in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado

allegedly taken away through legal trickery by Anglos and the U.S. Government in violation of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

Tijerina was literally born in a cotton field, where his mother was working. As a child he saw his family driven from three farms at gunpoint by owners who refused to pay for work completed; his father was crippled by a Texas Ranger from whom he had sought help to settle a land dispute; twice his father and grandfather were almost lynched by ranchers and Rangers in conflicts over land ownership near Laredo. The rise of Tijerina as a spokesman is described by Dunne:

> Forgotten by the state, old resentments still smoldering, the descendants of the conquistadores turned to Tijerina, who at the very least, whatever the plausibility of his dream, articulated their discontent. Dirt poor and land hungry, this onetime itinerant cotton picker turned preacher turned revolutionary roamed the high country, a peasant Don Quixote in search of windmills at which to tilt.[43]

In 1963 Tijerina began a series of trips to Mexico and Spain to determine validity of land grant claims and by 1966 was, as Nabokov declares, "a walking encyclopedia of land grant history."[44] Tijerina found that a section of the Kit Carson National Forest which contains the Echo Ampitheatre was once part of a Spanish-American land grant, and the title to the grant had never been settled in a court of law. In October 1967, 600 Spanish-Americans settled in the National Forest, declaring the establishment of the city-state of San Joaquin del Rio de Charma, with Tijerina as "proctor." Forest service signs were burned and two part rangers arrested for "trespassing." By the end of the week, the "sity-state" citizens had returned home. The Alianza received permission to hold a meeting on June 5th, but the day before the meeting the permit was revoked by state district attorney Alfonso Sanchez, a long-time Alianza opponent; twelve Alianza leaders were arrested. Furious, Tijerina and his followers "raided" the county courthouse at Tierra Amarilla to free the Alianza members and make a

citizen's arrest of Sanchez. On the morning of the raid, all charges were dropped. About fifteen minutes after the last defendant left the courtroom, the raiders entered. When the raiders left the courthouse, one deputy sheriff was dead and two others wounded; the raiders seized two hostages and fled to the mountains. National Guard, state police, sheriff possees and the Apache tribal police participated in the biggest manhunt in New Mexico's history. Grayson discusses the disregard for constitutional rights displayed during the search for Tijerina:

> During the manhunt, police entered homes without warrants, jailed suspects for as long as four days without charges, and at one point herded 50 people, most of them women and children, into a dung-filled cowpen where they were held for two days without adequate food, clothing, or sanitary facilities. When asked about the possible infringement of individual rights, General Jolley of the National Guard replied, "Let's don't get involved in Civil Liberties. None of them has complained."[45]

On June 10, after five days, Tijerina was arrested. He was acquitted after a short and stormy trial, in which he pleaded his own defense.

Ages of leaders differs in the two movements. Many current Black spokesmen became nationally recognized as leaders while in their early twenties. By contrast, Mexican-American leaders such as Chavez and Tijerina tend to achieve large-scale attention at a later age, in their late 30s or 40s. There are many other "leaders" of the Chicano movement, and many grassroots workers whose accomplishments are little known beyond their own communities. The changes wrought in Aztlan, the five Southwestern states where the great majority of Mexican-Americans reside, can best be measured by talking with residents of these areas. The strategies used and reactions of persons involved mirror those of persons involved in other American social movements.

Another basic difference between the movements is the role of the church. Many Black leaders were ministers, and early philosophies

were greatly influenced by theological principles. Unlike the Black movement, the Mexican-American movements have been more secular. A few priests have led movements, but most leaders are not clergymen. Chavez and Tijerina are farm workers; Muniz is a lawyer; Gutierrez is an educator. The tactics within the movement are as varied as the people involved. The concern about "violence" and the use of other tactics often feared is discussed by Mario Compean, a founder of MAYO (Mexican-American Youth Organization), who places the efforts not only of MAYO but most organizations within the movement into clearer perspective:

> At some point violent confrontations may be necessary for everybody, when the time is right. Probably it will happen, because everything seems to be pointing in that direction--not because the people want it that way, but because the institutions still refuse to respond whenever we demand our rights peacefully. They refuse to respond, so inevitably there will be violent outbreaks, and I am sure that people will be hurt on both sides. But it will be absolutely necessary for us to get justice.
>
> I talk about that because for three years, on every occasion that MAYO has made statements, implications have been made about what we have said. We have said that violence would come. Many implied from that that MAYO would possibly initiate it. But it has not happened. It has not happened because we are leading a mass group of people whose lives have to be considered before any action is taken. And in the long run, we have to weigh which would do more good and who will be hurt the most. Leaders come and go but the people remain. That's a consideration.[46]

A final difference between the movements is that the orientation of Black spokesmen tends to be urban and national while Mexican-American concerns tend to be rural and sectional. Many Black efforts have been aimed at large metropolitan areas, involving issues such as housing, public accommodations and corporate activities. Mexican-American movements tend to be aimed at localized issues such as wages and agricultural reforms. But conditions are changing, spurred by rapid changes in young Chicano's recognition of the need for immediate changes, and techniques for creating these changes. Vincente Ximenes, Commissioner of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, explains:

> for the first time in the past 100 years the Mexican American child is walking out in protest from grade and high schools with the consent of his parents. My parents had no choice except to insist that we attend school even though we fought our way into the school grounds in the morning and fought our way out in the afternoon. In between we took everything a prejudiced system offered. And, thirty years after the above incident, I find the education of the Mexican American has not improved. The number of school years attended may be higher, but the needed educational attainment level has become higher also. Thus in 1969 it is necessary we look at college enrollments and graduates. . . . the University of California at Los Angeles with an 18,700 total enrollment had 325 Spanish surnamed enrolled and probably less than 50 graduated in June out of over 9,000 graduates. . . . The University of Arizona approximately 3.2 percent of the June graduates were Spanish surnamed; at the University of Colorado at Boulder about 2.6 percent were Spanish surnamed; at the University of Texas at Austin about 3.9 percent; for the University of New Mexico at Albuquerque, we can take the 1940 graduation data and compare with complete 1968 data: in June 1940 there were 20 Spanish surnamed graduates out of 255 or 7.8%; in June 1960 there were 116 Spanish surnamed graduates out of 1,919 or 6% . . . less than 1940.[47]

V. Summary and conclusions

From this comparative analysis of the Black American and Mexican-American mass social movements, several conclusions arise. Five distinct philosophies have guided Black spokesmen and groups: Conciliation, Separation, Non-Violent Direct Action, Democratic Involvement, and Black Power/Militancy/Black Nationalism. The same five philosophies have been used in the Mexican-American social movement, with similar results.

Numerous similarities exist between the two mass social movements. But six major differences have been identified, which necessitate somewhat different techniques and communication behaviors in seeking social change. First, language and culture are different. While both groups are required to function in a white-dominated and controlled society, the Mexican-American frequently is required to do so in a "foreign" language--English. Much of the cultural identification lost to Blacks because of slavery was retained by Mexican-Americans. Second,

although education is viewed as necessary for members of both groups, the Mexican-American systematically has been denied educational opportunities to an even greater degree. The additional harassment of being required to speak English in school has aggravated this condition. Third, fewer visible national "leaders" exist in the Mexican-American movement. Perhaps this is due to less knowledge of the movement among the general American public. In both movements, "grassroots" or local workers have not achieved deserved recognition. Fourth, Mexican-American leaders tend to be older when they achieve wide-spread recognition. Fifth, the church (especially the Catholic Church) has greatly influenced members of the movement. Many Black leaders were ministers; few Mexican-American leaders are clergymen. Sixth, the communication behavior and techniques of spokesmen tend to reflect geographic differences. Blacks have emphasized urban concerns, Mexican-Americans have more frequently concentrated upon local issues and rural ooncerns.

Hopefully this study will serve to demonstrate a viable formula for evaluation of American protest communication. Similarly, trends, tendencies, attitudes and strategies noted in this work might readily be applied to any other large-scale mass social movement with beneficial results. Members and especially "leaders" of other social movements might properly look to Black and Mexican-American spokesmen, and the reasons for their successes and failures, to adopt new perspectives for their own causes. Successes and failures alike, and the reasons for these results, might predicate how leaders of other mass social movements may succeed. And current leaders of mass social movements are almost forced to evaluate the work of previous leaders for cultural and ethnic identification as well as for improving tactics.

REFERENCES

Willard A. Underwood (Ph.D., Bowling Green State University, 1972) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Theatre at Arizona State University, Tempe. Ralph E. Ferguson (M.S. candidate, The University of Southern California) is Managing Editor of TOO Magazine. Raymond Yeager (Ph.D., The Ohio State University, 1956) is Professor of Speech, Bowling Green State University.

[1]The term "Mexican-American" is generally used to describe all individuals whose ancestry includes Mexican roots. Within the "movement," however, most activists identify themselves as "Chicano." The latter term is used judiciously, where necessary, in this paper.

[2]Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Cleveland, 1962), p. 40.

[3]William Lang, "Public Address as a Force in History," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 38 (February, 1951), 34.

[4]Thomas R. Nilsen, Ethics of Speech Communication (Indianapolis, 1966), pp. 70-71.

[5]Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 42 (October, 1956), 287.

[6]Waldo W. Braden and Earnest Brandenburg, Oral Decision-Making, Principles of Discussion and Debate (New York, 1955), p. 489.

[7]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York, 1948), pp. 9, 21.

[8]James L. Golden and Richard R. Rieke, The Rhetoric of Black Americans (Columbus, 1971), p. 4.

[9]Charles W. Lomas, The Agitator in American Society (Englewood Cliffs, 1968), p. 4.

[10]Leland Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 38 (April, 1952), 188.

[11]Golden and Rieke, p. 4.

[12]Lyndrey Niles, "New Books in Review," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 58 (February, 1972), 113.

[13]Golden and Rieke, "The Rhetoric of Black Americans: A Proposal," unpublished manuscript in author's collection, n.d.

[14]Harry R. Ransford, "Negro Participation in Civil Rights Activity and Violence," Diss. The University of California, 1966.

[15]"Report From Black America: A Newsweek Poll," Newsweek, June 30, 1969, p. 23.

[16]Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method (New York, 1965), p. 18.

[17]Robert S. Cathcart, "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Western Speech 36 (Spring, 1972), 82.

[18]Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 56 (Spring, 1970), 1.

[19]Cathcart, p. 82.

[20]Cathcart, p. 87.

[21]"The Shift From Moderates to Militants: A Separate Path to Equality," Life, December 13, 1968, pp. 82-83.

[22]Lang, p. 34.

[23]Jorge Lara-Braud, "The American Dream and the Mexican-American," paper presented at the 58th Annual Conference of the Texas Social Welfare Association in San Antonio (February 24, 1969), p. 3.

[24]What is a Mexican? (unpublished report from The University of Colorado, 1970), p. 22.

[25]Senator Joseph Montoya, Hearings of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization (June 11-12, 1969), as reported in What is a Mexican?, pp. 16-17.

[26]Montoya, pp. 16-17.

[27]Lara-Braud, p. 3.

[28]Lara-Braud, p. 3.

[29]Lara-Braud, "Browns in Anger: The Overlooked Minority," paper presented to the Public Affairs Council in Washington, D.C. (June 5, 1969), p. 3. Originally compiled from statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

[30]Lara-Braud, "Browns in Anger," p. 3.

[31]Tomas Martinez, "Chicanismo," (Aztlan: The Chicano Studies Summer Institute, 1970), p. 5.

[32]Marcela L. Trujillo, "Guidelines for Employment in Chicano Studies," (Aztlan: The Chicano Studies Summer Institute, 1970), p. 1.

[33]Lara-Braud, "The Education of Mexican-Americans in Texas," from Hearings Before the Texas State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (December, 1968), p. 2.

[34]Lara-Braud, "The Education," pp. 4-6.

[35]Charles A. Ericksen, "Uprising in the Barrios," American Education (November, 1968), as reported in Lara-Braud, "Browns in Anger," pp. 5-6.

[36]Martinez, pp. 2-3.

[37]Rodolfo Gonzalez, I Am Joaquin (Denver, 1967).

[38]Jose Angel Gutierrez, address to MAYO in San Antonio (May 4, 1970), in La Raza Unida in Texas (New York, 1970), p. 11.

[39]Antonio Camejo, introduction to La Raza Unida in Texas, p. 5.

[40]Camejo, pp. 6-7.

[41]Lara-Braud, "Hispanic-Americans and the Crisis in the Nation," p. 6.

[42]Lara-Braud, "Hispanic-Americans," pp. 5-6.

[43]John Gregory Dunne, "Tijerina," Saturday Evening Post (April 20, 1968), p. 22.

[44]Peter Nabokov, Tijerina and the Courthouse Raid (Berkeley, 1969), p. 26.

[45]George W. Grayson, Jr., "Tijerina's Republic of San Joaquin del Rio de Charma," The New Republic (July 1, 1967), p. 10.

[46]Mario Compean, address to MAYO in San Antonio (May 4, 1970), in La Raza Unida Party in Texas, p. 9.

[47]What is a Mexican?, pp. 16-17.